

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

VOL. 45.—No. 9.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1823. [Price 6d.

*Published every Saturday Morning, at Seven o' Clock.*

## A LETTER TO LORD LIVERPOOL FROM THE KING OF FRANCE.

*On the Speeches of Mr. Brougham,  
Lord Liverpool, Mr. Huskisson  
and Mr. Canning, relative to  
the preparations which France  
is making for war against the  
New Spanish Government.*

[Louis might not take things so civilly as the *King of Bohemia*; and the consequences of his displeasure might be productive of inconvenience; therefore, I think it prudent to say, that I am the author of the following Letter; and, that I merely use the form in order to show what the King of France *might say*, if he had a mind to answer the above-named gentlemen.—WM. C.]

*Paris, 25 Feb. 1823.*

MY LORD,

It is with not less surprise than pain, that I hear my old friends *en Angleterre* holding the sentiments

that I find in Mr. Brougham's speech of 4th February, in your Lordship's speech of the same day, in that of Mr. Huskisson at Liverpool, and in that of Mr. Canning of the 21st February. Little did I imagine, that, in making preparations to defend my kingdom and its loyal inhabitants against the "*contagion of jacobinical principles*," I was doing that which would excite ill-will in and call forth disapprobation from you and Mr. CANNING, nursed as you both were in the warm and comfortable cradle of "*anti-jacobinism*," and almost swaddled by those immortal friends of "*social order*," PITT and DUNDAS. At the expressions of disapprobation from Messrs. BROUGHAM and HUSKISSON I was, indeed, less surprised, knowing the first to be a *feelosofer* and taking the latter to be "*citoyen Huskisson, Anglois, membre de la Society 1789*," vulgarly called the "*Jacobin Club*;" but, that *your lordship* and Mr. Canning should join in such disapprobation, appears almost in-

R

Printed and Published by J. M. COBBETT, No. 153, Fleet Street.

credible in spite of the full evidence of my eye-sight. What, my lord, do I hear the famous author of the *Anti-Jacobin* newspaper; do I hear the author of the "*March to Paris*:" do I hear them, who have, for thirty years, been so zealously labouring in the cause of "*paternal*" government; do I hear them censuring me for endeavours to restore the paternal government of Spain?

You have a debt of six hundred millions in *funds* created by the last war; more than a hundred millions of debt, under the name of *dead-weight*; nearly two hundred millions of debt, called *poor rates*; for this debt, or these rates arose out of the taxation and the paper-money, created to carry on the late wars. Nine hundred millions of debt have you, therefore, or forty-five millions a-year sterling, fastened on the nation for ever (unless you wipe it off by "*breach of national faith*."") This enormous debt have you contracted; this burden have you imposed upon yourselves; and for what? Why, to *prevent the contagion of jacobinical principles*. If this be not true, then all your professions were false. If you had any other motive than this, you were insincere in all

your declarations upon the subject from the first hour to the last. You always professed, that you did not wish to hurt, to humble or to weaken France. You always professed your sincerest friendship for me and my people, and the strongest desire to see us happy and flourishing. What you said you wanted, was, to *prevent the spread of revolutionary principles*; which principles, you said, would always be to be dreaded, unless the revolution itself were put down.

I may safely appeal to every impartial man in the world, for the truth of this statement. Have I not, then, wherewith to excite my astonishment in the assertions contained in the speeches above mentioned? Mr. BROUGHAM, indeed, is, as I before observed, a *feelosofer*, and, therefore, may be permitted to hold doctrines at war with paternal government. I shall, for this reason, only just notice two passages in the speech of that gentleman, the first of which related to the *drops of blood* shed in a palace, and the other, to the receiving of *gifts of territory* from BUONAPARTE. When Mr. BROUGHAM was alluding to a *certain murder*, he did not think proper to point out exactly *whom* he accused of the murder! If he

had done this, he must have gone to find out those, who *instigated* and who *paid* the conspirators who effected the murder! And, when his hand was in, he might have hunted out, perhaps, those who *hired and paid* the murderers of the *Prussian Envoy* at *Basle*, in Switzerland. Upon the whole, it appears to me, that the *drops of blood* might as well have remained unmentioned; and especially if he had looked back over the history of our times for not many months back.

As to the charge, which Mr. BROUGHAM thinks proper to make against Austria, for having received territorial dominion from Buonaparte, curious indeed, it is, that this learned gentleman should have forgotten that grand and general distribution of territorial dominion, made by Lord Castlereagh, he being then the Ambassador from England; curious enough that this should have escaped the recollection of this great advocate for national independence; and curious enough also, that he should say, in describing the conduct of Austria, in the receiving Venice from Buonaparte; curious that he should say, that, in this case, the *receiver was worse than the thief*; curious that he should say this, while, of Eng-

land's receiving *Ceylon* and *Trinidad*, he says not one single word! And who did she receive those from but from Buonaparte? This is as well known as any fact contained in history; and the knowledge of it might have checked Mr. BROUGHAM in his censure on the Emperor of Austria.

But, let me now enquire; let me lay Mr. BROUGHAM aside, and enquire on what ground it is, that your Lordship disputes the legal and moral right that I have to march, at this moment, an army into Spain. In your speech of the 4th of February, you say, "If the Spanish Constitution still wanted correction, it was in the power of the Spaniards to correct it, under their lawful Sovereign, that being the situation of Spain, whatever shades of difference might exist as to the expediency of interference of foreign nations in other cases, there was *no ground whatever for any interference with the Spaniards*. To justify any foreign interference, it must, at least, be shown, that those who led the public affairs of Spain, *wished to extend their operations to other countries*. But, after their unequivocal disclaimer of any object of that kind *no such justification existed*."

This is the doctrine laid down by your Lordship; and if this doctrine be sound, I am about to commit an act of aggression against Spain. The test by which to try this doctrine shall be, the rule of conduct which England has observed herself, upon former occasions. Upon what ground, then, did England embark in the war against France in the year 1793; in the year 1803; and in the year 1815? In the first instance, France not only did not declare war against England; but the Convention did every thing in its power to assure the English Government, that it had no intention whatever to injure its institutions, or to give encouragement to any of its own disaffected subjects to do any thing injurious to the English Government, or English institutions of any kind.

Your Lordship seems to admit that there does exist a right of interference *in some cases*. You do not deny a right to interfere *at all*. That would have been bold indeed, after the well known interference of England in the year 1793. But, you would seem to limit the right of interference to cases where the revolutionists of a neighbouring country “wish to extend their operations to our countries.” To any other coun-

tries does your Lordship mean? Or do you mean, to the *particular country* which interferes? In either case, the example of England will, I imagine, be quite sufficient. But, what are we to regard as the *evidence*, that no such wish of extending their operations to other countries exists? According to your doctrine we are to take the “*unequivocal disclaimer*” of the Spanish revolutionists as full proof that no such wish exists.

Now, my lord, look at the repeated *disclaimers* which England received from France in the years 1792 & 1793. The King of France, in a letter to the King of England; Monsieur CHAUVLIN in repeated notes to Lord GRENVILLE; Monsieur Le BRUN, Secretary of Foreign affairs in France; all these, in terms the most explicit and most positive, disclaim all intention to interfere, and to *extend their operations*, or to endeavour to propagate their principles beyond the territory of France, except in those cases where the sovereign of such territories had become the enemies of France. What was the answer given to these *disclaimers*? Why, that they were not believed; that if the parties were sincere who made the disclaimers, they had no power to act according to them;

that it was the revolutionary principle, and not the disposition of the men in power from which the danger arose; that it was necessary for England to draw the sword in order to defend herself against the *principles*, and not against the arms of France; and, there-upon, England did draw the sword. I appeal to the King of England's declarations; to the notes of his ministers; to the speeches made in Parliament, and, to the speeches of no persons with more confidence than to those of your lordship and Mr. CANNING: I appeal to all these for the truth of the fact, that the war was a war against *revolutionary principles*, and that war was justified by arguments, all expressed in these few words:—  
*"If your neighbour's house be on fire, have you not a right to interfere, in order to put out the fire, to prevent your own house from being burned?"* This was the whole of the argument as to the right of interference; and this very familiar illustration was actually made use of scores of times in both Houses of Parliament.

I might, therefore, call upon your lordship to show, on what grounds you refuse me the right of interfering in the affairs of Spain. My house is rather nearer to that of the Spaniards than yours

was to that of the French. You had the good fortune to have plenty of water between you and the flames that were raging in France; while I have no water at all between me and the Spanish house. You will scarcely pretend that it is not as easy for the liberals of France to commune with those in Spain as it was for the Corresponding Society to commune with the Jacobin club. You will, I should suppose, be equally reluctant to hazard the assertion, that the principles of the liberals differ, in any thing, worth notice, from the principles of those whom you so abhorred under the name of jacobins. Strange, indeed, then must it appear, that you assert that I have no justification for interfering in the affairs of Spain.

I can perceive, that your lordship was aware of the dilemma that this assertion of yours would place you in. Your interference in the affairs of France was notorious. The nation possess the fruits of it in *nine hundred millions of debt*. It was necessary, therefore, before you condemned my interference in the present case, to find out a *distinction*, between this case and your case. Hence your assertion of the *disclaimer* above noticed. I have

already observed, that you had a disclaimer equally "*unequivocal*" from the Convention of France. But, your lordship seems to forget, that there were several *stages* in the French revolution. In the year 1800, Buonaparte, having been made First Consul, tendered the olive branch to England; not only disclaimed all wish to interfere in the governments of other countries; but most solemnly protested that his anxious desire was for lasting peace. The answer he received was that the King of England could be convinced only by the "*evidence of facts*." The French minister TALLEYRAND stated with great solemnity that all the wild principles had been abandoned in France; that the system of France was changed. In answer to this, he was told, by Lord GRENVILLE, that the King could not rely upon pacific dispositions; and, in short, he was told that the King of England could see no security, except in war, or in the *restoration of the Bourbon family*. Lord GRENVILLE did, indeed, say that the King claimed no right to *prescribe a government to France*; but that he saw no chance of security in peace, with the system which then existed in France; or, in other words, that he had a right

to make war on that system for his *own security*.

The system then existing in France was, surely, less democratical, or jacobinical, or republican, or whatever you may call it, than that system which is now existing in Spain. Buonaparte was, in fact, the sovereign of the country; and the government was infinitely more monarchical than the government of Spain now is. *Two years* later, the Ministers of the King of England had the "*evidence of facts*" communicated to them; evidence arising out of some most tremendous *beatings* given to their allies. There had been no change in France. Her principles were still the same that they had been two years before: her pacific professions were still the same; and all the *evidence* that she had given consisted of an addition to her victories and an extension to her conquests. As yet Spain has given me no such *evidence*; and with your leave, my Lord, I think it prudent not to wait for it!

The "*evidence of facts*" having led to a peace at Amiens, it was soon found, that England could live at peace with the Consular Government; and we have the declaration of the then prime Minister, in these emphatical

words: "We are at war *because we cannot be at peace.*" According to all the long established customs of nations, there was no specific ground for the war of 1803. The pretended armaments in the ports of France were proved to be false: they were soon acknowledged on all hands to be false; and you returned again to the *old ground*; the necessity of defending yourselves against revolutionary principles.

At last came the year 1815. How BUONAPARTE came from Elba; how he was so fortunate as to escape the vigilance of your cruizers, and of your agents upon the island; how he came again to France, some future day, perhaps, may tell the world. But come he did, and his coming cost us our *museums*, our *frontier towns*, and many millions in *tribute*. To suppose that there were any of my *friends* who *contrived his return*, or who wished it, would be uncharitable; but certainly it cost us our museums, our frontier towns, a tribute, and it enabled my good friends, while their armies were at Paris to *request* of me, not for the benefit of the English colonies, but out of pure "*humanity*," a total abolition of the slave trade, which was necessary to stock the French colonies

and to enable them to raise sugar and coffee at as cheap a rate as the English Colonies. At that time, I did read, in the English newspapers, certain things called speeches in parliament, in which it was observed, that having "*now*" made a conquest of France, she ought to be disabled to *do mischief in future!*

\* \* \* \* \*

[I feel a great deal of interest in the affairs of the King of France; but a monstrous deal more in the affairs of England; I must, therefore, leave the above subject for the present, as our own terrible affairs now press upon us. The articles I have to insert are of deep interest to the country, and I must insert them.]

---

## PARLIAMENTARY COMMENTARY.

---

[From "*The STATESMAN*" daily  
*Evening Newspaper*, Feb. 27.]

---

## SURREY PETITION.

---

IN THE COMMONS,

THE most interesting matter that come before the House was the SURREY PETITION, which was presented by Mr. Den-

nison. Mr. Maberly objected to that part of the petition which contained a prayer for an equitable adjustment of contracts. Mr. Ricardo followed him, in somewhat the same strain. This was the *onset*! Not a very furious one, indeed. Nothing like so furious as the onset last year upon the two little words, "*just reduction*" contained in the petition of the county of Kent. Here, in the Surrey Petition was a prayer for a general adjustment of contracts, private as well as public, and specifically with regard to what is called the National Debt; and yet, so help us God, Mr. Calcraft sat still and said not one single word. It is curious, too, that this proposition, though it came this time out of Surrey, came originally from the same shop with the Kentish proposition. Mr. Calcraft, in the case of the Kentish proposition, said that *he* would have made the proposer take his horse and gallop off. God knows what *he* would not have done to him. While the discussion last night was going on, a friend of ours says he sat trembling, expecting every moment to see Mr. Calcraft rise; but the devil of one word did Mr. Calcraft say upon the subject!—This shows how we are getting on.

It makes the progress of the thing; and admonishes the fundholder to become a gold-hoarder as quick as possible; for, blind indeed must that man be who doth not see that the end approacheth.—Mr. Ricardo made but very poorly out. He talked of the *phenomena* of increasing revenue; and he called upon his opponents to *account for that* upon any other ground than that of the prosperity of the country. He did not know how there could be an increasing revenue and flourishing commerce, if Peel's Bill had been so destructive. Now, has Mr. Ricardo forgotten how the merchants were slaughtered in 1819? Has he forgotten too, what has passed within these twenty days; or cannot he understand the last Register and the last Register but two, where it is shown as clear as daylight, that a revenue may go on increasing; that commerce and manufactures may go on flourishing; and that, while these "*phenomena*," or by whatever other nonsensical name they may be called; while these are going on, all the landlords in the kingdom may be stripped of their estates, the farmers of their capital, and that the agricultural labourers may be reduced to beggary? Mr. Ricardo was called an

*Oracle*, by Messrs. Brougham and Wilberforce, at the time when Mr. Cobbett returned from Long Island, very soon after the passing of Peel's Bill. Last night the gentleman seems not to have been so confident as he was at the time that we are alluding to. He seemed to think that his doctrine stood in need of the prop of *authorities*; for, he read a letter, it appears, stating that Peel's Bill had had no effect, or very little effect, upon prices. Some one said that this letter was from Mr. *Peter M'Cullough* of the kingdom of Scotland; but, we imagine it came from Mr. Gladstone, or some such person at Liverpool; for Gladstone has, in a Liverpool newspaper, unequivocally asserted, that Peel's Bill has had no effect at all upon prices, and has even insisted that it *has not caused the gold to appear*. In short, that it has had no effect at all in any way whatever; and that prices would have been just the same, and gold come out just in the same manner and in the same quantity, if Peel's Bill had never been passed, and no legislative measure whatever had been adopted with regard to the currency! This, to be sure, is as little short of Bedlam as any thing that one can well imagine; but, the high

scene will be, when *Peel's Bill shall be repealed!* If that should take place; and take place it will to a certainty if we go to war; then will come the high scene; then will Mr. Ricardo and his authorities cut a brilliant figure. Not less than twenty shillings will buy a bushel of wheat in six months after that Bill shall be repealed; and then we shall hear what Mr. Ricardo has to say about the phenomena. Lord Folkestone followed Mr. Ricardo, and in the course of his speech, reminded the latter of his four and a half per cent. His Lordship explained a little the wonderful phenomena that so surprized Mr. Ricardo, and exposed the folly, the supreme folly, of relying upon the tables of Mr. Muschet. In short, he showed, which Mr. Cobbett has showed long and long enough ago, that the price of gold compared with that of the paper, was no standard at all whereby to measure the general depreciation.—After Mr. Sumner had said something tending to make the House believe that it was a poor little meeting in Surrey, though we are very sure that he never saw such a one there before in his life, Mr. Bennet rose, and having done justice to the meeting; having defended the yeomen

of Surrey against the observations of Mr. Sumner, proceeded, not to defend the prayer of the petition for the prayer of an equitable adjustment of contracts, contained in it; for that, in fact, appeared to stand in need of no defence; but to state that the House passed Peel's Bill from *ignorance*, and that that ignorance proceeded from Mr. Ricardo; that his doctrine was the foundation of all the ignorance that led to the fatal measure; that instead of such a measure, to consummate the ruin of the land, a measure for an equitable adjustment of contracts ought to have been adopted at that time; seeing that a breach of contracts, a breach of national faith had been committed against the debtors, even before, and long before that bill was passed. He distinctly traced the ignorance of the House to Mr. Ricardo; he went over some of the prominent features of the transactions of that day; and, in a very able speech, maintained the justice and wisdom of the prayer of the petition. Mr. Peel deprecated such premature discussion. The ministers were all in their places. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said not a word; and that which Mr. Peel said amounted to very little. That Mr. Peel should defend his bill is as natural as that father should defend child. But the defence that he made last night seemed to embrace many qualifications. It seemed to contain matter of a very abstract nature indeed. He said it was just to return to cash-payments in 1819, because it would have been just to return to those payments at any time after 1797. This was a curious sort of argument. A thing that may be just in itself may be wholly inexpedient. But, can it be just to pass a law to-day which induces me to bargain to give twenty pounds two years hence for a certain thing, and that compels me, when the time of payment comes, to pay sixty pounds for the thing in place of twenty? Can this be just? It is nonsense to tell me, that I *knew* that cash-payments were to return at the peace. I knew no such thing; and the best possible answer to this stale old assertion is, that they *did not* return at the peace, in spite of those Acts of Parliament; that they have not returned even yet; and that they will not have returned until the first of next May. Three-fourths of those who have been making bargains were actually *children* when the suspension of cash-payments took place. The idea of returning to prices such as we see now, never

once entered their heads since they were born. So that this is an assumption that is not worth a straw. No reasonable person can rest upon it for a moment. The nation *was* deceived; that is enough: it was ignorant of the consequences which would arise from the cash-measures. It could not possibly have been otherwise; but that is no matter. Debtors *were not apprized of their danger*. They have been wronged or ruined by the cash-measures. The wrong has been done; and this wrong now ought to be remedied. After Mr. Peel came Mr. Monck, who maintained the soundness of Lord Folkestone's doctrine with regard to the relative prices of gold and paper, in answer to the doctrines of Muschet and Ricardo. He agreed in opinion with Mr. Bennet, that the House passed Peel's Bill when it was in a state of profound ignorance upon the subject; and that ignorance he also traced to Mr. Ricardo.—Mr. Ricardo rose to explain. Lord Folkestone had said, that Mr. Ricardo had asserted at the time of passing Peel's Bill that prices would fall only *four and a half per cent.* in consequence of that bill, but that he had since acknowledged that the Bill had occasioned a fall of prices to the amount of ten per cent.

In explanation, Mr. Ricardo said, that the four and a half per cent. opinion was founded upon the notion that *his plan would be adopted*, and that it was the not adopting of his plan that caused the further fall of price to the amount of ten per cent. Who would not imagine, from this, that Mr. Ricardo opposed Mr. Peel's Bill. Let us now, then, hear what he said, in a committee of the whole House, on the Report of that committee which reported in favour of this very Bill of Mr. Peel. He said that "the proposed mode of resuming cash payments appeared to him the *easiest that could be imagined*." After descanting upon the ignorance of the Bank Directors, he observed upon the fearful and destructive depreciation that had at one time existed; "he was happy to reflect that we had so far retraced our steps. We had nearly *got home*, and he hoped the right honourable gentleman (Mr. Peel) would lend them *his assistance* to enable them to reach it in safety. He would venture to state that, *in a very few weeks, all alarm would be forgotten, and at the end of the year we should be all surprised to reflect that any alarm had ever prevailed, at a prospect of a variation of three*

"*per cent. in the value of the circulating medium.*" The honourable member "sat down amidst **"LOUD AND GENERAL CHEERING FROM ALL SIDES OF THE HOUSE"**!!!

This scene was in the House of Commons, on Monday, May 24, 1819. It was at this, particularly, that Mr. Cobbett laughed in Long Island. He sent twenty miles to bring his son up to help him laugh; and, between them, they read this passage over twenty times. "Mind," said he, "James, "I tell you what precious laughing we shall have at this in "England!" We dare not laugh at what passes in the House of Commons now since Six-Acts have been passed; but we may laugh at what took place there before. And so, he "sat down amidst loud "cheering from all parts of the "House!" Does not Mr. Bennet speak truly then! And was not the Act passed in consequence of the ignorance communicated to it by Mr. Ricardo? Observe, that the extract that we have just made comes out of a speech made *after* Mr. Ricardo's own project had been rejected, and another put in its place. It would be easy for us to show that his project would have produced the same effect; but that is wholly unnecessary.

Our extract is made from a speech made in favour of Mr. Peel's own report on which his Bill was founded.—And so, he "sat down amidst *loud cheers from all sides of the House!*" He did not so sit down last night. We imagined when we first read the Report, that Mr. Brougham could not have been present; because we saw nothing from him in support of his "*oracle.*" We find, however, that Mr. Brougham *was present*, and we see that he did say nothing; though this very Surrey Petition contained almost the whole of that Norfolk Petition which Mr. Brougham thought proper to censure on the *first day of the Session*. What is become of the Norfolk Petition itself Mr. Coke will of course let us know one of these days, when he has done with the hole-and-corner meetings in that county. He will take an opportunity, we dare say, of presenting the county petition when he presents that from the Hundred of LAUNDITCH, which petition from Launditch was *intended to be a protest against the county petition*, but which is a *petition for the county petition*; and, what is rather singular, and must be singularly gratifying to Mr. Coke, it is a petition coming from, not only his own consti-

tients, but, for the greater part, **FROM HIS OWN TENANTS.** This petition from the Hundred of Launditch will be found below, and we do hope that it will not be suffered to be presented to the House without due attention paid to it. We repeat that a meeting of the nobility, gentry, clergy, owners and occupiers of land in the Hundred of Launditch, was held on Wednesday, 19th Feb. that the Reverend Munnings moved the Rev. Dixon Hoste to take the chair; that Mr. Overman charged the magistrates, General Keppel and the Rev. D. Hoste, with having refused to accept a requisition from fifty-six respectable individuals of the Hundred; that General Keppel, after saying that he respected county-meetings, and thought that what was passed at them ought to be final, and that no other meetings ought to be held to put them aside; but that "here was a man that they *knew nothing about*, stepping forward with such resolutions that it became them to express their disapprobation of; that Cobbett would not propose any thing for their good; that he cared not for the farmers, whom he had called stupid and jolter-headed."—Let us stop here for a moment, to ask who this

General Keppel can be. We know, however, that he is one of our Generals; we know that we have to pay him; and we also know, that we for our parts have never heard of any of his military exploits.—The yeomanry of Norfolk knew, we dare say, a great deal more of Mr. Cobbett, than they ever knew of General Keppel, or ever will know of him.—Mr. Overman proposed the Rev. Mr. Maul to take the chair instead of Mr. Hoste.—Mr. Drosier then moved certain resolutions beginning with a *disclaimer* of the County Petition; which the second resolution views with abhorrence and detestation, and charges with proposing "a *violation* of all contracts between man and man, "a confiscation of property, and "a total destruction of national honour." Mr. Goddard JOHNSTONE proposed, that instead of these resolutions, the petition which we subjoin should be adopted. General Keppel said something here, the report of which we can hardly credit, though we take it from the Norfolk Chronicle: "The hon. gentleman also expressed his earnest desire to avow his disapprobation of the petition carried at the late County Meeting, because he had been so terribly *laughed at* by his friends

"on account of that petition." Mr. SUTTON said it was the *hireling press* which had endeavoured to hold the county up to laughter;—"the same press that had frightened Lord Suffield." (Great laughter here.) The Rev. Mr. Maul appears to have left the Chair. Mr. Beck manfully said, that he would second Mr. Johnstone, and he reprobated the requisitionists for their abuse of Mr. Cobbett. He called upon them to show that Mr. Cobbett was in the wrong; to meet him fairly and openly in county meeting, instead of acting the part of assassins, and stabbing him in their dark holes and corners. Mr. Beck appears to have made a very excellent statement, and he concluded by calling upon his opponents for another county meeting; he called upon them to leave their barn-assemblies, and to cease to stab in the dark.—Driven up into a corner in this way, the Rev. D. Hoste said, that perhaps it would be best to follow Mr. Archdeacon Bathurst's advice, and adjourn this meeting to a county meeting. Here were a few cries of "*Adjourn! Adjourn!*" Now came the test. Mr. Hoste and General Keppel were asked if they would now sign a requisition for another county-meeting. Mr. Hoste answered

NO! General Keppel said that he had declined the invitation of the arch-deacon: "for *who*, he would ask, was Mr. Cobbett, that they should give HIM a county-meeting? He was not a Norfolk man!" Some one said, "But he is an *Englishman*, as much as you!" Towards the close of the scene, Mr. Maul left the chair, and the magistrates also left their places and retired from the room. The reverend T. C. Munnings said, he "could remember the time when Mr. Coke was denominated the Dictator of Norfolk: now Mr. Cobbett was become the Dictator of Norfolk." The chair being empty, Mr. Beck rose, and said that "in the absence of those who were called their legitimate leaders, he should propose Mr. ROBERT FURNESS as their chairman;" which proposition was received with great applause. The amendment was then put and carried unanimously, and here that amendment is:

SHEWETH,

That your petitioners, during a long and disastrous war, cheerfully made every sacrifice requisite for the honour and security of the country; that now, overwhelmed by an immeasurable burden of misery and distress, they are constrained to approach your Honourable House, to require that attention to their just and grievous

complaints, which their lamentable nature demands.

That the numberless appeals made to your Honourable House, by an impoverished and degraded people, have hitherto been regarded as the mere effusions of idle discontent, not as the wailings of a long-suffering and overburthened nation, which apathy and neglect they can only ascribe to their not being duly represented in the Commons House of Parliament.

That their bounden duty to the Constitution, transmitted to them by their forefathers, compels them, boldly though respectfully, to assert their claims to those rights and liberties confirmed to them by the glorious Bill of Rights. And that excessive and unequal taxation is the primary cause of all the evils they so poignantly deplore.

That to avert impending ruin, anarchy, and confusion, restore happiness and prosperity to this once envied land, the Members of your Honourable House must be freely chosen by the people, and become what the Constitution contemplated they should be, the jealous and undaunted defenders of the people's rights, and the faithful guardians of the public purse.

That the large sums voted by your Honourable House in support of the Church Establishment, entitles your petitioners to pray for an appropriation of a moiety of the public property, called Church property, and also the proceeds of the sale of all Crown lands or estates, towards the liquidation of the public debt.

That your petitioners further pray for an abolition of all sinecures, pensions, grants, or emoluments, not merited by public services.

For a reduction of the Standing Army, in all its various departments, to a scale of expence not exceeding that of the army prior to the last war.

For a co-extensive reduction of

the Civil List, and of all the salaries of the Royal Family, Officers of State, and others, now paid by taxes, extorted from the exhausted funds of a sinking nation.

For the total repeal of the tax on malt, beer, soap, candles, and leather, and such a diminution of the Interest of the National Debt as the imperious necessity of the times requires, and public justice has a right to expect.

And that your Honourable House will forthwith enact a law, that will secure to Englishmen an efficient Representation in the Commons House, restore to them the Constitution in its original purity, and thus perpetuate the once-boasted supremacy of Britons.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

---

We beg Mr. Coke to have the goodness to appoint a day for the presenting of this petition, and to inform *Mr. Cobbett*, who is one of his constituents, of that day. We think it should be presented with the petition that is coming from the barn at Cromer, they will form such a loving pair. Both taken together will show how very wise it is to endeavour to over-set county petitions by hole-and-corner meetings.—We have wandered very widely here from our parliamentary subject: so widely, indeed, that we have no hope of returning to it to-day, and shall therefore not attempt it.

[From the same, Feb. 26.]

IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

NOTHING to call for particular notice, except that it is no more than due to the *Lord Chancellor* to say, that he carried himself very temperately in his triumph over the *marriage act* people. Lord ELLENBOROUGH having moved something about the *new marriage act*, the *Lord Chancellor* observed, "that it would be better to introduce a few words into this bill, just for the purpose of its being understood that the clauses of the old marriage act, which were repealed by the act of last session, were by the present bill again brought into operation."

IN THE COMMONS,

The only subject worthy of attention was a notice given by Mr. BROWNLOW, of a motion (for 15th of May) on the subject of the *ex officio informations* in Ireland. The reason for this long delay was, as stated by Mr. BROWNLOW, in order that the discussion should take place with the whole of the Irish members in the House. We should make no remark upon this had the *Morning Chronicle* been silent; but that paper persists in taking an open part in favour of Mr. Plunkett; or, rather, it continues to endeavour to justify the

policy of Lord Wellesley, which policy we think not to be justified, however good the intentions of the noble lord may have been. We shall insert the remarks of the *Morning Chronicle* to which we allude, in order to caution our readers against being influenced by any observations of the same sort.

"It is impossible for any reflecting mind to be indifferent to the critical situation of Ireland. The question is not whether Catholics or Protestants shall be most favoured by the state, but whether the existing laws of the country shall be the rule of its government, or that Government abandon its functions and its power to a desperate and flagitious faction, who acknowledge no guide but their inflamed prejudices and rancorous bigotry. His Majesty's cordial acceptance of the cordial loyalty of the whole Irish people, was gall and bitterness to those who conceived themselves as much entitled to a monopoly of the royal regard and kindness as to that of all power and emolument. A new excitement throughout the vast ramifications of the Orange system succeeded. The concession to the Catholics in 1782 produced the outrages, which, in 1785 and the following years, desolated the country.—The great legislative relief of 1793 was marked by renewed enormities, and a more regular organization of the Orange system, and ultimately as a consequence, by the rebellion of 1798. At each of these epochs it was sought to render nugatory the determination of the legislature. To borrow the parliamentary language of Mr. GRATTAN, 'They (the Orangemen) had repealed by their

"own authority all the laws lately made in favour of the Catholics, and had established in place of law the inquisition of a mob. . . . Other *insurgents* had been put to death in the field and on the scaffold; but with regard to Orangemen, they had met with impunity, and success, and triumph. They were permitted to triumph over the law, over the magistrates, over the people." Such was the *picture drawn* by this statesman and patriot in 1796, and the features and the colouring are true to the life in 1823."

First we would observe, that *orangeman* means Protestant; and that *orange system* means *Protestant system*. Next, we would observe, that the Chronicle could not have fallen upon a more unlucky authority than Mr. GRATTAN. Mr. Grattan was given to draw pictures; and he helped to draw the picture which sent us into the last war against Buonaparte, which war gave us the inestimable benefit of the Bourbons, of which benefit *we are now tasting*. A-propos, of the Bourbons; and the Chronicle has not been so furious for war against the said Bourbons, since it has been taught that war would cause the jews and jobbers to be paid off *honestly in good hard paper-money*. But, to return to Mr. GRATTAN, that gentleman could draw something else besides pictures. He could draw *bills*;

and not much of *accommodation bills* neither. No small bills: but a good, *bona fide* bill, for the *shutting up of Irishmen in their houses from sunset to sunrise*; and for transporting them in case of breach of this bill, *without trial by jury!* There have been several editions or revivals of this bill; but it was drawn by the late Mr. GRATTAN while he was in office, and left as a legacy to his successor.—We have always been on the side of the catholics; that is to say, we have always wished to see their religion not only perfectly tolerated; but to see them really put upon a level with the protestants. But, we have always said, that this never could be done by what has been called *catholic emancipation*; and have always insisted, that any thing short of doing away with the *protestant church establishment*, could have no tendency to produce any thing but irritation and mischief.—And what are the proofs that the Chronicle produces? Why, it says, that His Majesty's conduct while in Ireland, his attempts to *conciliate* the parties, only produced an additional quantity of bitterness between them. It says, that the *concession* to the catholics in 1782 produced outrages which desolated the country. It says, that the con-

cessions to the catholics of 1793, finally produced the *rebellion* of 1798! After this, what are the rhetorical flourishes of Mr. GRAT-TAN? And is it not ridiculous to talk of quieting Ireland by little nibblings at the protestant power. We would put the catholics, as we said before, upon a level with the protestants. We view the thing in its true light. We would act as statesmen ought to act. We *would have peace* in Ireland. And if we could not have it one way, we would have it in another. If we could not have it by putting the catholics on a level with the protestants, we would have it by firmly maintaining the predominance of the protestants. Any middle course is only giving fuel to the fire of animosity and desolation. Here is a fine country actually torn to pieces by little miserable attempts to reconcile parties, as much opposed to each other as fire and water. The great curiosity is, too, that the Chronicle abuses the Roman catholic religion pretty liberally; calls it all manner of names; accuses it of favouring despotism; accuses it as essentially connected with darkness and tyranny: does all this; and, in an article the other day, recommends that *itinerant methodists should be sent about Ire-*

*land to root it out*; is guilty of all this injustice towards a religion which is yet the religion of the far greater part of the Christian world: does all this; wants to put down the religion, while, at the very same moment, and in the same breath, it denominates the opponents of it in Ireland a *flagitious faction*, and seems enraged that any one should disapprove of some of them being proceeded against by *ex-officio* information, after a grand jury had thrown out the bill of indictment against them. Upon the conduct of the Marquis Wellesley we wish to make no comment. We give him credit for perfectly good motives. We think that those who attempted to assault him were very brutal villains; but, we repeat again and again, that his policy has been, in our opinion, erroneous in the extreme.

---

### NORFOLK YEOMAN'S GAZETTE.

---

THIS is a *weekly newspaper*, intended to circulate amongst the yeomanry and farmers, and country tradesmen, *all over the kingdom*. It will be furnished with a

due portion, I dare say, of what a dry politician like me cares nothing at all about; and what a great many women and men, too, prefer, and with good reason, perhaps, to hard-headed politics. In short, it is a weekly newspaper, and is to be regularly obtained, by *newsmen* in London, and of newsagents in the country, in the same sort of way that all other weekly newspapers are. It arose out of the proceedings of the late county meeting in Norfolk. The newspapers published in that county; and particularly a newspaper called the "*Norwich Mercury*," had long, in my opinion, been doing every thing which the slender talents of a Mr. "C. BACON;" that is to say, Mr. Cockey Bacon, would enable it to do, to make that ruin of agriculture complete, which was only, as yet, about half finished. This person appears to have been driven half mad by the passing of the famous *County Petition*. Mr. COCKEY BACON, in the frenzy of his fury, fell upon the whole body of yeomen of the county. This paper was established to counteract these efforts; which efforts had a direct tendency to prevent any relief whatsoever being given to the land. However, if no such particular inducement had ex-

isted, it was high time that the great and industrious county of Norfolk, and, indeed, that *all the counties*, should be furnished with a weekly newspaper, containing correct information, correct news as to our situation and as to the prospects of the farmers; and, above all things, a paper containing a defence of those principles, which point out an "equitable adjustment of contracts, public and private," as the only safe and effectual remedy for the present disorders, and the only means of preventing a convulsive revolution. This paper *was expected* to have great success; but its success has been full four times as great, as any one could reasonably have calculated on. This is not, perhaps, very surprising, however, when we consider the dreadful sufferings of the country, and the indignation which the agricultural people must necessarily entertain against the editors of the "*Farmers' Journal*," and the rest of those blind guides, who have done them so much mischief. This paper contains a weekly *Commentary on what has been doing in Parliament, during the preceding week*. It contains the best account that I can give of what is intended to be done in *Parlia-*

*ment during the ensuing week.* It contains, every week, an article dated *London, Friday*, in which article I give my readers a statement of my view of whatever I deem to be most interesting to them. It is a view of the state of affairs *generally or particularly* as the occasion may require. It is this: it is a letter, which I, who am in London, and have all the means of correct information about me; it is a *weekly circular letter*, which I write; and it is such a letter as I should write to any private friend in the country, giving him my opinion of all the public matters that I think most interesting to him. Meaning, as I do, that the paper shall be of *general utility* to the owners and occupiers of land, and to country people of all descriptions, I shall be glad to receive communications from any part of the kingdom, postage paid, directed to J. M. Cobbett, 133, Fleet Street, London. As I observed before, the paper may be had by application to any of the newsmen in London, or any of the newsagents in the Country. Some persons will smile at my advising them *not to take the Farmers' Journal any more but to take this paper instead of it.* I do, however, give them such advice; and if they

will but try the effect of the change, I am satisfied that they will receive perfect conviction of its benefits. Every writer; indeed every person, wishes for success in his undertakings, be they what they may; and the *profit* attending the success usually forms no small part of the grounds of the wish. Let the reader, if he choose, ascribe a pretty good share of my wish for success to this motive; but I do, most solemnly assure him, and I think experience ought to make him believe me, that the main motive is to combat those errors, which have been so ruinous, which have been productive of such dreadful mischief to the land and labour of the country. The only question of real interest at this moment is, shall the rest of the country be devoured by the jews and jobbers? I am for its not being devoured; and to assist in saving it from that fate, was one of the main objects in establishing this paper. Our friends, in all parts of the country, ought to be zealous and active in promoting the circulation of that which cannot fail to have considerable influence in the deciding of this great question. This publication is of much more interest to the landlord, the farmer, and the

country tradesman than it is to me. If we are to be saved at all, it must be in consequence of the united efforts of the people. And, what can so strongly tend to unite them, as their having a just view of their danger? Nothing is so likely to give them that view as their reading a paper of this description, instead of the delusive trash, which, generally speaking, they now get in those vehicles which are called weekly newspapers.

---

### “EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENT.”

---

THESE two words express the subject of the contest which has now actually begun between the *land* and *labour* on the one side, and the *jews* and *jobbers*, on the other side.—The petition of Mr. THOMSON prays for an “equitable adjustment of contracts;” prays for that which has been more abused, than, perhaps, any thing that ever was proposed in this world. I will first insert this petition, and then just put a question or two to those who have been, for two months past, railing against the Norfolk Petition and traducing and calumniating its author.

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

*The Petition of Charles Andrew Thomson, of Chiswick, in the County of Middlesex,*

MOST HUMBLY SHEWETH,

THAT Your Petitioner has, for many years past, paid large sums of money, out of the produce of his industry, for the support of the Government and laws of the Country; that he has always been taught to believe, that, in return for this support, he had a right to expect from the Government and Laws protection in the rightly enjoyment of his property; but that he has, by that Government and by those Laws, been despoiled of his property, and that, from a state of opulence, he has, by the unjust effects and irresistible force of Acts of Parliament, been reduced to a state of ruin and bankruptcy.

That your Petitioner imputes no intentional wrong-doing to Your Honourable House or to any branch of the Government; that to err is not to be criminal; that it is not given to man to be free from error; that from error wrong may innocently be committed; and that of that obstinate perseverance in error, which converts unintentional wrong into premeditated injustice, your Petitioner confidently hopes that he is not doomed to witness an instance in the conduct of Your Honourable House.

That Your Honourable House has not now to be informed of the mighty mischiefs resulting from the measures for returning to Cash Payments, unaccompanied as they unhappily were with measures for rectifying contracts; that the cries of thousands upon thousands of families, suddenly plunged into penury and want, from a state of ease and of plenty, cannot fail to have reached the ears and to have awakened the compassion of Your

Honourable House; but that, amongst the thousands upon thousands of sufferers, your Petitioner believes, that the case of few can exceed, in hardship and injustice, that to which he now most earnestly begs the attention of Your Honourable House.

That your Petitioner and his Father (now deceased) were Oporto merchants for thirty years, and in the most extensive trade; that, in this trade, and in that of wine merchant, in which your Petitioner's Father had been for many years previous to those thirty, they gained a large fortune; and that in 1811 and 1812 they, with a part of their capital, made divers purchases of Land.

That they purchased the Estate of Northaw, in Hertfordshire, for which they paid, in ready money, 62,000*l.*; on which estate they built two excellent new houses and six cottages, and broke up 200 acres of land, which they brought into a state of fine cultivation; that the whole of these improvements cost them 10,000*l.*; and that the estate, therefore, has cost them 72,000*l.*

That in 1812 your Petitioner and his Father bargained for the estate of Pontrylas, in Herefordshire, for 60,000*l.*, the proprietor of which estate was John Ashfordby Trenchard, Doctor of Divinity, of Highworth in the county of Wilts, and paid 5,555*l.* as a deposit; that the Title was by the law adviser of your Petitioner deemed not good, and that your Petitioner accordingly refused to complete the purchase, and brought an action for the deposit; that the vender applied to the Court of Chancery to stop the action; that the question remained undecided in that Court until 1819, during which time your Petitioner had not the power to sell the Estate; that at the end of that period the Vice Chancellor decided against your Petitioner; that there was then due to Trenchard for purchase money and in-

terest thereon, 71,957*l.* 19*s.* 5*d.* and from Trenchard to your Petitioner for rents received 6,839*l.* 1*s.* 9*d.* making a balance against your Petitioner of 65,118*l.* 17*s.* 8*d.*

That in the mean time your Petitioner had experienced great reverses in his commercial affairs, in consequence of the same all-ruinous cause, and, being unable to pay the sum of 65,118*l.* 17*s.* 8*d.*, gave to Trenchard a mortgage for 65,000*l.* on the Estates of Pontrylas and Northaw.

That between the year 1819, when the Chancery suit was decided, and July 1821, your Petitioner paid in part of the debt of 65,000*l.* the sum of 5,000*l.*; and 8,000*l.* interest on the same up to July 1821.

That on the decision of the Chancery suit your Petitioner was put into possession of the Estate, and continued in possession until he became bankrupt; during which time your Petitioner received, on account of rent and timber, 3,410*l.*

That in July 1821 your Petitioner offered the two Estates for sale, but could not obtain for them a price at all equal to his expectations or the amount of the sum for which they were mortgaged.

That in October 1821 your Petitioner became a bankrupt.

That Trenchard thereon took the proper legal steps to retain the profits of the estate, and has since given notice of fore-closing the mortgage.

That thus your Petitioner has actually paid to Trenchard 18,555*l.* while he has received from the estate 3,410*l.* and is in danger of losing both this estate and his estate at Northaw, which cost your Petitioner 72,000*l.*

That, on the other hand, Dr. Trenchard has received in cash from your Petitioner 18,555*l.*; together with the whole rents of the estate from the time of sale up to the year 1819; and that he has now applied to the assignees of your

Petitioner for leave to take the two estates, together with all arrears of rent, which are due from February 1820 (and which, together with timber felled, your Petitioner estimates at about 3,500*l*.) in lieu of the debt of 60,000*l*.

That the Assignees of your Petitioner are now praying the Court of Chancery to agree to the above proposal, and that if the prayer should be granted, Trenchard will have received the whole rents and profit of the estate except for two years, and 1,470*l*. for timber; that he will have been paid 18,555*l*. by your Petitioner; and that in addition to his own estate he will have acquired the estate of Northaw, which cost your Petitioner 72,000*l*.

That your Petitioner and his deceased Father purchased other estates, in 1811, in the counties of Middlesex, Essex, and Hants, for 33,166*l*. which have now been actually sold for 12,000*l*.; that your Petitioner and his Father, owing to the depression in the price of land, and to a like depression in that of their stock in trade, were in 1821 reduced to a state of bankruptcy; that seven children of your Petitioner, ten children of his Brother, and seven children of his Sister, will now be left wholly destitute, while your Petitioner's Father, with a heart broken by these calamities, died in the year 1822.

It is to prevent this act of crying injustice and cruelty that your Petitioner humbly implores Your Honourable House to interpose the exercise of that power which You possess, for the purpose of protecting His Majesty's people against oppression. Your Petitioner thinks it wholly unnecessary to take up the time of Your Honourable House in shewing, that this threatened confiscation of his property has arisen wholly from those Legislative measures which have produced that change in the value of money, which has taken two-thirds from the price of Agricultural produce, and which

has, of course, lessened in the same degree the price of land. His case is so plain that it cannot be misunderstood; and, therefore, begging leave to remind Your Honourable House of the Bank-Suspension-Act in 1797, of the Suspension of Actions against the non-resident Clergy in 1800 (which actions were afterwards quashed by an Act of Your Honourable House) and of the suspension of the Landlord's power of distress against Tenants, in 1812; your Petitioner begging leave to remind Your Honourable House of these precedents, most humbly prays Your Honourable House to suspend the power by which the Mortgagee above-mentioned may be enabled to take from him his Estate; and he further prays Your Honourable House to cause such equitable adjustment of contracts between man and man, as may prevent the utter ruin of your Petitioner, and of the numerous persons dependent for their bread on his pecuniary means.

And Your Petitioner will ever pray—

CHARLES ANDREW THOMSON.

Now, then, let me ask any *honest* man, whether Mr. Thomson is not entitled to redress; whether Trenchard ought, in addition to the eighteen thousand five hundred and fifty-five pounds, which Mr. Thomson has already paid him for nothing; let me ask any *honest* man, whether Trenchard ought to receive the Northaw estate also for nothing? No one, surely, except a real villanous jew will answer in the affirmative. And yet, what is to protect Mr. Thomson; what is to save him and his family; where is

he to look for protection, or the hope of protection; except in that equitable adjustment of contracts; except an act of parliament, to cause a suspension of the unjust powers of the mortgagee; which adjustment, and which suspension are prayed for, in this petition? Notice of a motion on this subject has been given by Lord FOLKESTONE; and on this motion, the question must come to issue. Mr. THOMSON and his father were made bankrupts *solely* in consequence of the transactions stated in the petition. The wine which they had in hand, and which was worth about twenty thousand pounds, sold off, under a commission of bankruptcy, fetched about ten thousand pounds. The whole of their debts under the commission did not exceed thirty thousand pounds; and, besides their estate in land, their effects sold for more than fifteen thousand pounds. The stamps, auction duty, and law expenses relative to the estates, amounted to upwards of six thousand pounds. So that the money actually paid to Trenchard, besides this six thousand pounds lost; the eighteen thousand pounds paid to Trenchard, and the fifteen thousand pounds worth of effects sold under the commission of bankruptcy,

would have been more than enough to pay all their debts, at twenty shillings in the pound, and to leave them the Northaw estate (which cost them seventy-two thousand pounds,) wholly untouched.

Here, then, is a scene of injustice! These consequences have not arisen from idleness, from folly, from extravagance, from improvidence of any sort; but solely from the change in the value of money, which was *caused by the acts of the government*. Those acts violated the contract. Mr. THOMSON was called upon to pay in a currency almost three times as high in value as that in which he had made the contract. It was no fault of his that the value of the money had been changed. The government caused his ruin. And shall not the government have power to give him redress? Has it not power to do right as well as to do wrong? Shall he, and all the children dependent upon him; shall they all be stricken down for ever, rather than that the government shall acknowledge itself to have been in error?

Let us, for a minute, make the case of Mr. THOMSON *our own*. Thousands upon thousands are in his situation; but, let us make his case *our own*. Let us look at the

*hundred and five thousand pounds*, that he is about to sink here; let us look at the *twenty-one thousand pounds*, which he has sunk in his other estates. Let us look at his own seven children (besides others *connected with him by ties of blood*;) let us look at those seven children, brought up with all the fair prospects which the industry and the integrity of the father and grandfather had created for them; let us look at those seven children, with a mother by their side, seeing the father, after being made a bankrupt, compelled once more to begin the world anew; when he ought to be reclining at his ease; let us look at them, dependent now upon his life and upon exertions which he is making under such great disadvantages; let us look at them and think of their feelings; and then let us *look at Trenchard* and behold, in his riches, in his triumph; in his having two estates for one; let us here behold, the consequences of those fatal measures, for wishing to rectify the wrongs of which the sensible yeomen of Norfolk have been represented as *revolutionists and robbers*!

Mr. THOMSON, with a degree of fortitude which it is impossible too much to admire has again resumed his trade of wine merchant.

Such industry and such courage seldom fail to meet with success, in some degree or other. But *life* is uncertain. Who is to insure the continuance of his exertions for his family; and shall that family be left in this state, by that government, which has been the cause of their ruin? To keep "*faith*" with Mr. THOMSON, the government must stop the mortgagee and rectify the contract. The faith of the government was pledged to him, when he made his contract. The faith has been broken by the alteration which the Government has subsequently made in the value of money. Therefore, to keep faith with him; or rather, to return to good faith with him, there must be an "*equitable adjustment of contracts between man and man.*" This is what he prays for; and to this he has a perfect right. We trust that his prayer will be granted; and if it be not, we shall have no hesitation to declare that this is the most unjust government that ever existed under the sun.

WM. COBBETT.

---

TO MR. HUME.

---

*Kensington, Feb. 23, 1823.*

SIR,—To do justice to your persevering efforts to cause a *reduc-*

tion of expenditure and to expose the *jobbing* belonging to that expenditure; to do justice to these efforts no one has been more ready than I have. But, Sir, from that which is reported as your speech of Friday last, I am satisfied, that you will much more than render those efforts of no use to the nation, if you act upon the declaration contained in that speech. I have looked at all the morning papers, and they all agree in the substance. — The words of the *Chronicle* are these:

MR. HUME—He could not sit down without stating, that “nothing would occasion him greater regret than to find a majority of that House assenting to any proposition which would rob the public creditor of even a shilling of his demand; and he thought that His Majesty’s ministers deserved the thanks of the country for the firmness with which they had maintained its faith with the public creditor. The cause of the ruin of many States had been the violation of faith with their creditors and he trusted that we should never imitate such an example. He was as anxious as any man could be, to afford relief to that branch of the community which was now so much distressed, but he could never consent to it at the expense of the public faith.”

Taking you to mean, by *public faith*, that paying of three for one to the fundholders which is now going on, and finding that you *thank* the ministers for this con-

fiscation of the property of the landowners, farmers, labourers, and country tradesmen: finding that you *thank* the ministers for this, I must conclude, that the money, that you want to save, you *intend* for the *jews* and *jobbers*; and I, for my part, would rather see the labour of the ploughman mortgaged even to parsons and sinecure placemen than to the grasping, villanous *jews*. The former will, in all probability, spend in England what they get. The other wretches rake it together to lend it to any despots in foreign countries, that want it, even to make war against England itself.

The *funding-system* is the great root of all the corruptions, of all the loss of liberty and happiness in England, and of all the English feebleness which is now about to put Spain into the hands of our old and bitter enemy. And, you being such a *desperate* supporter of this all corrupting and now confiscating system, any thing that you may do in the way of *lopping off expenses*, I can look upon as proceeding from no other motive, than that of taking from other branches to give to this branch, which is already the most mischievous of the whole.

In short, if the gold payments

proceed, there must be an open division: the *land and labour* against the *jews and jobbers*. The *ploughman's* labour is now as much a subject of *confiscation* as the estate of the *Lord*. I, for my part, am not only not the friend, but am the enemy, of those who would beggar the villages, in order to enrich this Jewish *Wen*; and these persons I regard as ten thousand times more the enemies of the country even than those who support the expenses that you would curtail: the latter may be profligate; but, the former are hard-hearted and malignant as Shylock himself.

You are pleased, it seems, to assert, that you know of *many states which have been ruined* by what you call "*robbery of creditors*," and what we call an "*equitable adjustment of contracts*." Would you be so kind as to name to us any of *those states*? You may, to be sure, call *Julius Cæsar*, *Colbert*, *Chamellard*, *General Washington*, and *Comte Metternich*, a parcel of *fools*, and tell them to "*take their change out of that*;" but, I wait, Sir, to hear you name *one single state* that has ever been ruined, or even injured by a reduction of the interest of its public debt.

I am, Sir,  
Your most humble and  
Most obedient servant,  
WM. COBBETT.

### DR. O'MEARA.

I BEFORE stated, that, though I never read the Doctor's book, I did publish an article which might induce some persons to read it. This being the case; that is to say, I have published an article which, by implication, might mean, that I thought the Doctor's a *good book*; as my opinion would necessarily have a good deal of weight with many persons; as the book is full of charges against *Sir Hudson Lowe* and the *Ministers*, and divers other persons: this being the case, I think it a duty—a duty towards the public, towards all the accused parties, and towards *Sir Hudson Lowe* in particular, to insert the following article from the *last Quarterly Review*. The reader will see, that the *Reviewer* refers his readers to Mr. MURRAY for a sight of O'MEARA'S *original notes and letters*. Not able to spare the time myself yesterday, I sent to Mr. MURRAY a person in whom I can safely confide. He saw all the notes, copies of which are published by the *Reviewer*, together with several others; and, though he is unacquainted with the hand-

writing of O'MEARA, he says, that there cannot be the smallest doubt of the authenticity of these documents. O'MEARA has published a letter to the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, in which he says, that the Reviewer is a *scoundrel*; but he does not deny the authenticity of the documents. The article in the *Review* relates to *all the looks* that have been published about the treatment of Napoleon and the French at St. Helena. The extract relates to O'MEARA's book only. I shall make no comment on this extract: it needs none; it is conclusive against every thing short of *proving the notes to be forgeries*.

We have engaged to make O'Meara *refute himself*, and to convict him by his own confessions; and we are now about to produce another batch of his letters, which, we are confident, will surpass any expectation that can have been formed of the man's baseness and folly.

Mr. O'Meara may, perhaps, affect to see some difference between being a spy for the governor, and a spy for his official friends in England, or for the booksellers; but even this paltry subterfuge we shall not allow him; we shall show that, after all his rant about principles

and honour, he *volunteered* to be a spy to the governor himself, and consummated his duplicity by *forcing on Sir Hudson Lowe* his reports, not only of what passed amongst the men at Longwood, but even interlarded the details relative to his *female* patients, with sneers and sarcasms of the lowest kind: we could not have believed this on any verbal statement whatsoever—nothing, in short, but the having before our eyes—as we have—the proofs, would have induced us to state so incredible a fact; and we now proceed to lay them before the eyes of our readers.

Sir Hudson Lowe was accompanied to St. Helena by Captain Sir Thomas Read, as aide-de-camp, and Major (now Lieut.-Colonel) Gorrequer, as military secretary. These two gentlemen partake of course, next to Sir Hudson, the honour of O'Meara's abuse; almost every time that he mentions their names it is to cast some ridicule or odium upon them. Yet it is to these gentlemen that he was *in the habit voluntarily* of addressing frequent notes containing the intelligence which we are about to produce, and which, after all the surgeon's boasting of Sir Hudson's designs, and of his

own high principles of honour, will astonish the world.

In these notes we see no allusion to their being *answers* to any inquiries; and several passages distinctly show that they were O'Meara's own *unprompted* effusions.—In a note to Sir Tho. Read, dated the 6th of July, 1816, after recounting an anecdote of Madame Bertrand (which we shall hereafter quote for another purpose,) he concludes—

“*If you think* Sir Hudson would like to know the above circumstances, you had better communicate them to him.”

Here we find that so little desirous was Sir Hudson of hearing tittle-tattle, that in a matter of curiosity and importance, (as we shall see when we come to the anecdote itself,) O'Meara speaks doubtfully about Sir Hudson's even wishing to hear any reports. Again he says, in another note to Sir Thomas Read, dated the 12th of July, 1816—

“Madame Bertrand told me yesterday, that Las Cases had said the Emperor was his god—the object of his veneration and adoration! *This she desired me not to mention.* I forgot to tell it to Sir Hudson yesterday; I dare say it will make him smile.”

Here, again, is a piece of idle chit-chat of no kind of importance, except that Madame Ber-

trand desired it not to be repeated; and yet O'Meara, merely with a view to *make Sir Hudson smile*, hastens to impart it to Sir Thomas Read, with a kind of apology for having forgotten to betray his female patient *the very day* she had made him her confidant.

In a third note O'Meara states a certain fact to Sir Thos. Read, and authorizes him, “*if he thinks* it would be acceptable, to communicate it to Sir Hudson Lowe, but not as coming from him.”

We suppose our readers will not ask any further proof that O'Meara's communications of this nature were not only not *forced*, but not even *asked*, from him, and that they were in the strictest sense of the word, *voluntary*. Nor were they what can be called *private*; for the two officers seem to have had no *private* acquaintance with O'Meara, and the notes were generally addressed to them in their official characters. They usually began with some matter of business, and then the little anecdotes—specimens of which we are about to produce, were, as if casually, slid in. The honourable minds of Sir Thomas Read, and Colonel Gorrequer, never conceived the double treachery which O'Meara was prac-

tising, and they looked upon these anecdotes as the ordinary gossip of a village doctor, and paid little attention to them till the subsequent conduct and calumnies of O'Meara recalled them to recollection; and it was found that, by good luck, enough of this correspondence had been preserved to confound the writer.

We have Sir Thomas Read's and Colonel Gorrequer's authority for this statement, and the notes themselves are deposited in Mr. Murray's hands, to satisfy any one who might doubt the accuracy of our quotations, which we confess will be scarcely credible.

Let us look at some of the topics of these communications, and compare them with the corresponding passages of his work. The reader will see, that to the baseness of "*espionnage*" he adds that of falsifying in his book the statements which he had originally made.

One of the most grievous, and apparently the least excusable, offences, charged upon Sir Hudson Lowe, is that on the arrival of the Marquess de Monchenu, the French commissioner, at St. Helena, Sir Hudson refused Madame Bertrand permission to see, and inquire of the Marquess the state

of her *mother's* health, whom he had lately seen; and that he rejected, with equal cruelty, a similar desire from Las Cases to inquire after his *wife*.

" July 6th, 1816.—Madame Bertrand informed captain Poppleton and myself, that she had written a letter to M. Monchenu, in which she had requested him to call at her residence, as she had heard that he *had seen her mother, who was in an indifferent state of health*, and she was *very desirous* to inquire about her; that Las Cases would also come and meet him on his arrival, as he was informed that Monchenu *had seen his wife* a short time before his departure from Paris."—Vol. i. p. 70.

The fact of this letter having been sent *direct* to the French commissioner, and *without the governor's knowledge*, was enough of itself to prevent M. de Monchenu's accepting the invitation; but this was wrested into a design of Sir Hudson to torment Madame Bertrand, when, in fact, he only disapproved of the invitation having been sent by an improper and secret channel. It is obvious that if Madame Bertrand could have a letter of invitation irregularly conveyed, she might equally well have had letters of *another import*, and the practice once established, there would have been no limits to the correspondence, and no

check whatsoever on Buonaparte's intrigues. But was it, indeed, likely that Madame Bertrand's filial piety, and poor Las Cases' uxurious anxiety were to be made the cover of a *communication of Buonaparte's*? — perhaps not likely, *but it was so!*—the story of the *mother and wife* was all a *fable*, and the whole was a device of *Buonaparte's own* to open a communication with the newly arrived Frenchmen; and the best part of the affair is, that it was O'Meara himself—the faithful, confidential, high-minded O'Meara—who betrayed the plot, and put Sir Hudson Lowe on his guard against the fraudulent pretences of Madame Bertrand's letter. On the very day that Madame Bertrand made him the confidence above stated, viz. on the 6th July, he writes to Sir Thos. Read the following *very different account* of it:—

"Madame Bertrand told me this morning, that the letter she wrote to Monchenu was at the express desire of *Buonaparte himself*,\* repeated twice to her; and that in case he had come up, old Las Cases was to have *immediately* proceeded to her house in order to have an *INTERVIEW*\* with him.

"If you think Sir Hudson

\* The *italics* and *large letters* are so marked in O'Meara's original note, with the obvious view of guiding the governor's suspicions to the real facts of the case.

would like to know the above circumstances, you had better communicate them to him."

Not a word of the *mother*—not a word of the *wife*—not the slightest allusion to *ill-health* and *anxieties*; but a direct and clear warning to Sir Hudson Lowe to beware of the plot which Buonaparte had planned, and to prevent the *INTERVIEW*—which word, in order to mark his own suspicions that an *illegal interview* was intended, O'Meara had written in great letters, and double-underlined.

(To be continued.)

## MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending 15th February.

Per Quarter.

	s.	d.
Wheat .....	41	4
Rye .....	23	10
Barley .....	28	2
Oats .....	18	7
Beans .....	25	4
Peas .....	31	10

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, 15th February.

	Qrs.	£.	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat 11,984 for 26,490	17	2	Average, 43	6			
Barley 7,301	11,788	2	11	30	2		
Oats 10,944	12,020	11	11	21	10		
Rye .....							
Beans 2,259	2,828	2	4	25	0		
Peas 1,153	1,899	1	0	32	11		

SMITHFIELD, Monday, Feb. 24th.

*Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).*

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	3	8	to	4 4
Mutton .....	4	0	—	4 6
Veal .....	4	8	—	5 8
Pork .....	3	8	—	4 8
Lamb .....	0	0	—	0 0

Beasts ... 2,390 | Sheep ... 16,690  
Calves .... 133 | Pigs ..... 250

NEWGATE (same day).

*Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).*

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	2	8	to	3 8
Mutton .....	2	8	—	3 8
Veal .....	3	4	—	5 0
Pork .....	3	0	—	4 4
Lamb .....	0	0	—	0 0

City, 26 Feb. 1823.

## BACON.

In our last we stated that this article had advanced from 26s. to 28s. per cwt. on board; and that the manufacturers refused to continue shipping at the latter price. Since then some considerable purchases have been made at 30s. 31s. and even 32s. under particular circumstances. So great is the eagerness to buy, that we should not be surprised to see a further advance of several shillings per cwt. if no one check the present spirit by selling out. Landed, 34s. per cwt.

## BUTTER.

Every thing that is *fine* is readily bought up; but there is very little of that description. Some Government contracts in *other lines* are expected to be immediately advertised; and the knowledge of this, together with many corroborative circumstances, induces many to think that there will be a war; and that, consequently, our Government will want supplies. Against this combination of opinions and circumstances there is the *fact* of a great *want of confidence*, which, though it may not prevent a general advance in the prices of pro-

visions, yet, being *well founded*, it will, probably, prevent those ruinous consequences which have resulted from past speculations.—Carlow, 84s.—Belfast, 73s.—Newry, 74s.—Dublin and Waterford, 68s. to 70s.—Cork and Limerick, 68s.

## CHEESE

The prices of Cheese are advancing more rapidly in the country, than in London. The best kinds of Gloucester are the only kinds that are really *scarce*.—Cheshire, Old, 56s. to 66s.; New, 48s. to 54s.—Derby, coloured, 50s. to 56s.; Pale, 48s. to 52s.—Double Gloucester, fine, 56s. to 60s.; single, 44s. to 50s.

## HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay . . .	60s. to 80s.
Straw . . .	40s. to 50s.
Clover . . .	80s. to 84s.
St. James's.—Hay . . .	60s. to 84s.
Straw . . .	42s. to 54s.
Clover . . .	67s. to 84s.
Whitechapel.—Hay . .	68s. to 84s.
Straw . . .	34s. to 42s.
Clover . . .	70s. to 88s.

## Price of HOPS, per Cwt. in the BOROUGH.

Monday, Feb. 24.—There is but little doing in Hops: good Sussex Pockets, and Mid Kent Bags and Pockets, fully support their prices. Weald Kent Bags, from 45s. to 56s., are lower.

*New Bags.*

Kent .....	£ 2 5—£ 4 0
Sussex .....	2 2— 2 10
Essex .....	— —
Yearling Bags . .	28s.—40s.

*New Pockets.*

Kent .....	£ 2 10—£ 4 0
Sussex .....	2 6— 2 16
Essex .....	2 10— 3 10
Farnham .....	6 0— 7 0
Yearling Pockets .	35s.—45s.